

**Appln. No. 10/589,059**  
**Amdt date August 5, 2010**  
**Reply to Office action of May 5, 2010**

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 2A and 4 . These sheets, which includes Figs. 2A and 4 , replace the original sheets including Figs. 2A and 4.

Attachment:                Replacement Sheets  
                                 Annotated Sheets Showing Changes



**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 32-44 and 47-62 are pending in the application, of which claims 50-55 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-31 were previously canceled, and claims 39-41 are indicated as allowable. Claim 45 and 46 are also cancelled.

Applicant is filing herewith a Substitute Specification in which all of the figure numbers that include small letters have been amended to include capital letters for consistency with the figure numbers in the drawings. No new matter has been added.

The drawings have been objected to because Figures 1, 2B and 3 do not show from where the cross sectional views of these figures are taken. Applicant has amended FIG. 2A to show the cross section lines for FIGS. 1A, 2B and 3. Applicant has also amended the Brief Description of the Drawings section in the Substitute Specification to describe the noted section lines. Additionally, the description for each of FIGS. 1A, 2B and 3 now refers to these figures as being a cross-sectional view of a portion of the view shown in FIG. 2A. FIG. 4 has been amended to remove the section line upon which this objection is based.

Claims 32-38, 42-49 and 56-62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nichtennung (DE patent no. 40 21 011 A1). Applicant has amended claim 32 to include the limitations of canceled claims 45 and 46. Furthermore, claim 32 has been amended to recite "wherein the securing element is located opposite the projection." Support for this amendment is provided in Amended English Translation of the Specification at page 12, lines 10-15, page 15, lines 21-27, and page 18, lines 4-10. Applicant believes that Nichtennung does not disclose the noted limitations of claim 32.

Referring to FIGS. 1 and 2, Nichtennung does not disclose that the base 2 or the shaft 5 has a positive connection element opposite the lug 12 and formed by a projection projecting radially outwardly from the base 2 for positively retaining the cable drum 1 when the cable drum 1 is mounted on the base 2 or the shaft 5. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 32 and dependent claims 33-38, 42-44, 47-49 and 56 and 62 are patentable over Nichtennung.




**Appln. No. 10/589,059**  
**Amdt date August 5, 2010**  
**Reply to Office action of May 5, 2010**

Based on the above, Applicant believes that claims 32-44, 47-49 and 56-62 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Saeid Mirsafian  
Reg. No. 52,035  
626/795-9900

SM/llb

LLB IRV1119290.1-08/5/10 6:04 PM